



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,683	04/10/2001	Mark E. Rose	2072P	1899
57580	7590	09/18/2008		
STRATEGIC PATENT GROUP, P.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 1329			CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q	
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94042				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/832,683

Applicant(s)

ROSE, MARK E.

Examiner

AZIZUL CHOUDHURY

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-10,12,13,15-18,20-22,24,25,27-30,32-34,36 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-10,12,13,15-18,20-22,24,25,27-30,32-34,36 and 39 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Final Drawing (PTO-846)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

This office action is in response to the correspondence received on March 12, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3-6,8-10,12,13,15-18,20-22,24,25,27-30,32-34, 36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood et al in view of the FileNet Functionality Sheet, hereafter referred to as Levergood and Functionality Sheet, respectively.

1. As to claims 1, 13, and 25, Levergood disclose: a method for controlling access to file on a server over a network, the method comprising: allowing a content originator to publish a file on a first server and to specify what users are authorized to access to file (column 3, lines 16-21, Levergood); replicating the file from the first server on a second server; in response to receiving a URL request from a client for a file from the first server, determining if a user of the client has been granted authorization to access the file, wherein a client address apparent to the first server differs from a client address apparent to the second server (column 2, line 60 – column 3, line 4, Levergood); generating a transfer ticket

from the first server to the client that includes an identifier identifying the particular file on the second server if the user has been granted authorization access, wherein the transfer ticket is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server (Levergood teaches the SID (equivalent to ticket) generated being able to comprise a telephone number (hence not bound to the client address); see column 3, lines 37-42 and column 9, lines 7-20, Levergood); in response to receiving the transfer ticket from the client by the second server, redirecting the client back to the second server with a URL ticket, wherein the URL ticket is bound to the client address apparent to the second server (see column 3, lines 20-42, Levergood); and in response to receiving the URL ticket from the client, verifying the URL ticket on the second server and returning the file (column 3, lines 43-49, Levergood).

While Levergood does teach the use of a document management system and multiple servers (see Column 8, 59-61), Levergood does not specifically teach allowing a content originator to publish a file on a first server, or specifying user authorization for a particular file, or file replication. The FileNet Functionality Sheet, on the other hand, does disclose: allowing a content originator to publish a file on a first server and to specify what users are authorized to access the file (see Functionality Sheet, lines 30-35); replicating the file from the first server on a second server (see Functionality Sheet, lines 56-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Levergood with FileNet's product in order to provide ease of use

(see FileNet Functionality Sheet, line 18), system scalability (see FileNet Functionality Sheet, line 21), and high performance (see FileNet Functionality Sheet, lines 14-16).

2. With regards to Claims 3, 15, and 27, Levergood further discloses: The web browser has not been customized to request tickets (see Column 4, lines 24-31, Levergood).
3. With respect to Claims 4, 16, and 28, the FileNet Functionality sheet discloses: allowing the content originator to specify what access privileges each user has with respect to the files, the access privileges including read, write, and delete (see lines 30-35, FileNet).
4. With regards to Claims 5, 17, and 29, the FileNet Functionality sheet further discloses: allowing the access controls to be specified before and after the file is replicated onto the second server (see lines 30-35, FileNet).
5. With respect to Claims 6, 18, and 30, Levergood et al further discloses: storing the name of the file in a database along with access privilege specified for the file, and when a user makes a request to access the file, looking up the name of the file in the database and determining if the user has been granted access to the file (see Column 6, lines 58-67, Levergood).

6. With respect to Claims 8, 20, and 32, Levergood discloses: Placing into the URL ticket a path parameter, a start parameter, a use-by parameter, an end parameter, a uid parameter, a clientid parameter, a sessionid parameter, and a referrer parameter, and a message authentication code (MAC) (see Column 5, lines 56-65, Levergood).
7. With respect to Claims 9, 21, and 33, Levergood discloses: Binding a combination of "basedir+path+sessionid" to an IP address of the client at first use of the URL ticket (see Column 6, lines 5-8, Levergood).
8. With respect to Claims 10, 22, and 34, Levergood discloses: Verifying the URL ticket as valid when: (i) the MAC is correct, (ii) a current time is between values of the start and use-by parameters, or the "basedir+path+sessionID" combination has previously been used for the same IP address, (iii) the "basedir+path+sessionID" combination has not been used from a different IP address, and (iv) the URL requests a file that is in a subtree rooted by basedir+"/"path (see Column 6, lines 5-16, Levergood).
9. With respect to Claims 12, 24, and 36, the FileNet Functionality sheet further discloses: providing a content server as the first server and providing at least one replica server as the second server (see lines 56-57, FileNet).

10. With regards to claim 39, Levergood teaches through FileNet, a method for controlling access to file on a server over a network, the method comprising: (a) allowing a content originator to publish a file on at least one content server and to specify what users are authorized to access to file (see column 3, lines 16-21, Levergood); (b) replicating the file from the content server on at least one replica server; (c) in response to receiving a URL request from a client for a file from the content server, determining if a user of the client has been granted authorization to access the file, wherein a client address apparent to the content server differs from a client address apparent to the replica server (see column 2, line 60 – column 3, line 4, Levergood); (d) generating a transfer ticket that includes an identifier identifying the particular file on the at least one replica server if the user has been granted authorization access, wherein the transfer ticket is not bound to the client address apparent to the content server (Levergood teaches the SID (equivalent to ticket) generated being able to comprise a telephone number (hence not bound to the client address); see column 3, lines 37-42 and column 9, lines 7-20, Levergood); (e) in response to receiving the transfer ticket from the client by the content server, redirecting the client back to the replica server with a URL ticket, wherein the URL ticket is bound to the client address apparent to the replica server (see column 3, lines 20-42, Levergood); and (f) in response to receiving the URL ticket from the client, verifying the URI ticket on the replica server and returning the file (see column 3, lines 43-49, Levergood).

While Levergood does teach the use of a document management system and multiple servers (see Column 8, 59-61), Levergood does not specifically teach allowing a content originator to publish a file on a content server, or specifying user authorization for a particular file, or file replication. The FileNet Functionality Sheet, on the other hand, does disclose: allowing a content originator to publish a file on a content server and to specify what users are authorized to access the file (see Functionality Sheet, lines 30-35); replicating the file from the content server on a replica server (see Functionality Sheet, lines 56-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Levergood with FileNet's product in order to provide ease of use (see FileNet Functionality Sheet, line 18), system scalability (see FileNet Functionality Sheet, line 21), and high performance (see FileNet Functionality Sheet, lines 14-16).

11. The motivation applied to claims 1, 13, and 25, are applicable to all their dependent claims.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed March 12, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The following are the examiner's response to the applicant's arguments.

The principle point of contention involves the claimed transfer ticket which is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server. The applicant contends that the Levergood art fails to teach this since it teaches the SID (equivalent to transfer ticket) comprising the client's IP address (col. 3, lines 37-42, Levergood). The examiner disagrees with this assertion. While this is one embodiment, the examiner directs the applicant's attention towards column 9, lines 7-20. Within that section, Levergood teaches the SID (equivalent to transfer ticket) generated being able to comprise a telephone number (hence not bound to the client address) if desired. Thus, the claimed embodiment is taught by Levergood.

As for the new claim 39 which recites a content server and a replica server, a careful analysis of the claim language reveals that the claim is equivalent to claim 1 except the first server is now called the content server and the second server is now called the replica server. Hence the same rejection applied to claim 1 is applicable to claim 39.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2145

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AZIZUL CHOUDHURY whose telephone number is (571)272-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2145

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2145